

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 96 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**October 23, 2002**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, October 23, 2002 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor J. J. Berry Smith (In the Chair)  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice President  
(Policy Development) and Associate  
Provost  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost,  
Faculty  
Mr. Syed Ahmed  
Professor Derek Allen  
Ms Honor Brabazon  
Mr. Adam Chapnick  
Professor Mary Chipman  
Dr. Inez Elliston  
Professor Anthony Haasz  
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Professor Lynne C. Howarth  
Mr. Josh Hunter

Ms Vera Melnyk  
Mr. David Melville  
Professor Robert Reisz  
Mrs. Susan Scace  
Professor Dennis Thiessen  
Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos

Non-Voting Assessors:

Dr. Sheldon Levy, Interim Vice-Provost  
Students  
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard

Regrets:

Professor James Donaldson  
Ms Ranjini Ghosh  
Professor David Jenkins  
Professor Alexandra Johnston

Professor Cheryl Regehr  
Professor Keren Rice  
Mr. Vivek Sekhar

In Attendance:

Dr. Peter Munsche, Assistant Vice-President, Technology Transfer  
Ms Judith Chadwick, Associate Director, Government Research Infrastructure Programs, and  
Director, Connaught Programs, Office of the Vice-President, Research and International  
Relations  
Ms Erin McGinn, Director, Operations and Government Relations, Office of the Vice-  
President, Research and International Relations  
Mr. Paul Fraumeni, Director, Strategic Communications, Office of the Vice-President,  
Research and International Relations

**Report Number 96 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 23, 2002**

---

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**Chair's Remarks**

The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting. He introduced the assessors and invited the members to introduce themselves. He noted that a membership list and some information about the Committee had been included in the agenda package. He encouraged members to ask questions about the Committee's role as the meeting proceeded.

**1. Time of Adjournment**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was agreed

THAT the meeting adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m.

**2. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 95 of the meeting of May 15, 2002, was approved.

**3. Guidelines for Divisional Submissions: Amendments**

Professor Tuohy noted that at the May meeting, the terms of reference of the Committee were discussed and revisions were recommended to the Academic Board. Revisions to the Guidelines for Divisional Submissions were also reviewed. The latter was a document that guided the academic divisions in preparing proposals for consideration by this Committee. Both documents were extensively discussed at that time and although the terms of reference were forwarded and later approved by Governing Council, the Guidelines were deferred until the fall to ensure consistency with the Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference had appended to them a chart listing examples of the kinds of proposals the Committee would deal with. It was a living document and would be updated periodically. A few minor changes as listed on the cover sheet have been made to the Guidelines and the revised document was presented for approval.

There were no questions.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The *Guidelines for Divisional Submissions*, dated October 10, 2002.

**4. Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy: Admission Requirement**

The Chair indicated that Professor Hindmarsh was a member of the Committee and would be prepared to answer questions on this item.

Professor Tuohy noted that there had been some concern for a number of years over the level of preparation in biology at the high school level for students entering the Pharmacy program. The bachelor's program was a second-entry one, requiring all applicants to have completed one year of university-level study. The Faculty continued to have the same concerns

**Report Number 96 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 23, 2002**

---

**4. Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy: Admission Requirement (cont'd)**

with respect to the new high school curriculum and was, therefore, proposing that students take a university-level biology course for admission.

In answer to a question, Dean Hindmarsh noted that most applicants had two or three years of university preparation.

A member asked about the concern with the new high school curriculum. Ms Swift responded that the curriculum had been reviewed and accepted as adequate preparation for first-entry university programs. Specific preparation in biology was required for the Pharmacy program.

The Chair noted that the Committee usually considered the impact of a proposal on other academic units in the University. In this case, he noted that about 2,000 students took first-year biology courses. He suggested that the impact of this requirement on the Faculty of Arts and Science would be minor.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, beginning in the 2004 admission cycle, a first-year level university Biology course be a pre-requisite for admission to the undergraduate program in the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy.

**5. Vice-President, Research and International Relations: Annual Report, 2001-02 and Plans, 2002-03**

Professor Tuohy noted that the Committee had general responsibility for policy on and monitoring the quality of education and research activities of the University. The Committee spent a great deal of its time looking at academic programs. This was an opportunity for the Committee to look at the research endeavour. She noted that she made a similar presentation to the Business Board at the invitation of the chair.

She introduced the directors from her portfolio who were present and thanked them for their contributions to the success of the research enterprise and for their assistance in the preparation of the report.

A copy of Professor Tuohy's presentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A". The highlights include:

for 2001-02:

- total research revenue, including hospital research, \$478 million
- first in federal granting council payments
- first in Government Research Infrastructure Program awards
- strong lead in institutional share of faculty honours compared to faculty size
- implemented campus-wide program, *My Research Online*
- opened the Exceler@tor, an incubator for spin-off companies in the information technology sector

**Report Number 96 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 23, 2002**

---

**5. Vice-President, Research and International Relations: Annual Report, 2001-02 and Plans, 2002-03 (cont'd)**

for 2002-03, work:

- to ensure permanent funding for the indirect costs of research from the federal government
- to establish a strong working relationship with the new provincial Ministry of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation
- to increase government financial support for graduate students, including international students
- to enhance funding for faculty in social sciences and humanities
- to create international benchmarks for research performance
- to support the academic planning process.

Following the presentation, members had a number of questions and comments. A member noted that research was one of the most important aspects of a university but it should also support the teaching activities. Did it actually affect the quality of teaching? Professor Tuohy believed that great research made a difference. For example, at the University of Toronto, Canada Research Chairs were expected to teach undergraduates as well as graduate students. At some universities, they were solely researchers. The academic planning process placed a great deal of emphasis on the key linkage between research and teaching. In the tenure process, a candidate must be excellent in teaching or research and competent in the other. If candidates did not teach well, they would not receive tenure or be promoted. She expected that this would be one of the most important considerations in the search for new faculty. Professor Goel added that the Office for Teaching Advancement, under the direction of Professor Kenneth Bartlett, was developing new programs to assist in mentoring of new faculty and to prepare them to teach. He agreed that in the search process, there was an emphasis on teaching. Some departments required a candidate to give a lecture as part of the process and comments were sought from the students. He reminded members that there was a document titled Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions. This document would be under review this year. Individual divisions were encouraged to develop their own guidelines based on this document.

A member referred to the advocacy plans listed in the report and asked about OSAP reform. The Chair indicated that this matter was not on the topic of the research report but Dr. Levy agreed to respond briefly. He said that there was a joint working group with a number of student members. The issue of part-time student funding was part of the review. He expected that there would be recommendations that part-time students be treated fairly and on the same basis as full-time students. With respect to the member's second question, the Chair asked that he raise the matter under other business.

A member raised a question about benchmarks. He noted that most members of the University community would expect the University to be number one in Canada in research and when it was, they might become complacent. He applauded the idea of international benchmarks. He asked whether the University should set goals concerning the number of awards it received or the percentage of funding it was awarded. Without specific goals, it was hard to determine whether the University was achieving its objectives. Professor Tuohy explained that the University had not established particular targets but had instead tracked progress in specific areas. It then analyzed why its performance was up or down in a particular area. She suggested that it would be difficult to set magic numbers and that it was better to review the trends and comparisons with peers. For example, the University was number two in SSHRC funding per eligible faculty member and would strive to be number one.

**Report Number 96 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 23, 2002**

---

**5. Vice-President, Research and International Relations: Annual Report, 2001-02 and Plans, 2002-03 (cont'd)**

A member asked about the status of funding for the indirect cost of research. Professor Tuohy reported that the issue was mentioned in the throne speech but without specific numbers attached to it.

A member congratulated Professor Tuohy on assuming this portfolio on an interim basis and producing this excellent report. She particularly liked the *Edge* magazine and thought that it explained cutting edge research in terms the public could understand. Professor Tuohy accepted the congratulations on behalf of her expert team.

**6. Calendar of Business**

The Chair said that the Calendar of Business was presented to the Committee for information. It gave the schedule of known events and would be updated regularly at the agenda planning meeting. Proposals from academic divisions would be added to the calendar as they were received. The Calendar of Business was posted on the Governing Council website.

Professor Tuohy drew particular attention to the March meeting at which the reviews of academic programs and units would be considered. The White Paper on academic planning was tentatively scheduled for discussion at the April meeting. She reminded members that the planning exercise would start with the release of a “green paper” or a discussion document that would explore the question of what it meant to be a great public research university - what that term implied in terms of the student experience, the faculty and resources. After broad consultation and discussion of this issue, a white paper would come to this Committee for comment.

The Chair asked whether there would be an opportunity for this Committee as a group to discuss the green paper questions. Professor Tuohy said that she would ensure that progress on the planning exercise would be part of her assessor’s report and that she would be happy to receive input from the Committee.

**7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

The Chair commented that this was a regular feature of the Committee’s meetings. It was an opportunity for the assessors to report to the Committee and to respond to questions members might have about the assessors’ portfolios.

Professor Tuohy said that she had nothing further to report.

Professor Goel gave an update on the anti-plagiarism initiative referred to at the May meeting of the Committee. Through the Council of Ontario Universities, the University had obtained a site license for the software package, turnitin.com. The program was available now and was being presented as part of an overall initiative involving the Office for Teaching Advancement and the Adaptive Technology Resource Centre. How best to communicate with students on this topic was currently under consideration by the various partners in the initiative.

A member asked how wide-spread problems with plagiarism were. Professor Goel said that it was the most common discipline charge with about 300 cases identified each year. However, it was suspected that there were many more instances that were not identified or pursued for a variety of reasons.

**Report Number 96 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 23, 2002**

---

**7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)**

Dr. Levy reported that he was spending a great deal of his time on enrolment matters, arising from the expected double cohort. In addition to discussions on the numbers of students and the expected obligations of the universities, there was the question of adequate resources. Planning for how to deal with this challenge had been ongoing for a number of years and it had been expected that at this point in time, the plan would have been set. Instead, work was still being done. He noted the University's well known position that capital funding would need to be forthcoming before the University would accept more students. That funding has been discussed regularly at meetings with the government but none had yet materialized. This issue was occupying a great deal of his time. He said that the public, especially the students, were extremely anxious about their university prospects.

A second initiative involved a review of the Ontario Student Assistance Program or OSAP. A working group of university administrators and students from the student campus groups and Governing Council were studying the Program and hoped to make a number of recommendations on such issues as help for part-time students and the real costs of university education. He hoped that a draft paper, with recommendations, would emerge shortly and be taken up by the government as a basis of reform of OSAP. He noted that the University's bursary funds could not replace OSAP funding but should instead be used to supplement it. The government had a major responsibility in this area.

Dr. Levy recalled that Governing Council had asked the Provost's Office to undertake an accessibility and career choice study in the Faculty of Law. He said he expected the matter would be discussed at the next meeting of the Committee. A thorough review of the current literature on career choice has been conducted in order to avoid duplication of effort. In fact, they had found that this area was well studied in the United States. The Provost was currently looking at the data and would be developing a methodology shortly.

His final report concerned the Orchard report on graduate student financial support. A committee with student representation had been established to monitor the implementation of the recommendations, including the guaranteed funding package of \$17,000. It was canvassing the University community for policy or fiscal concerns. To date, no problems had surfaced; he believed the program had been very successful.

A member asked whether, in the preparation of the methodology, the Provost would consult with the students in the Faculty. Dr. Levy responded that there would be a discussion with the Law community shortly.

On a new issue, a member asked if the University administration was aware of the Canadian Association of University Teachers' (CAUT) proposal for a Canada Post-Secondary Education Act. It included the following principles: public administration, accessibility, collegial governance, comprehensiveness and academic freedom. Student groups on campus were engaged with this issue. He asked if the University was aware of this proposal, what was the University's position? He asked what positive steps could be taken in support of the proposal? Both Dr. Levy and Professor Tuohy were unaware of the document and were not prepared to respond.

The Chair reminded members that if notice was given of proposed questions or new issues that they wished to raise at the meeting to the assessors or the secretariat before the meeting, responses could be prepared.

**Report Number 96 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 23, 2002**

---

**7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)**

Ms Swift had nothing to report at this time.

**8. Items for Information**

- (a) School of Graduate Studies (SGS): Combined Master of Science in Physical Therapy (M.Sc.P.T.) / Master of Science in Rehabilitation Science (M.Sc.) Program

The Chair noted that under the new terms of reference and as displayed in the attached chart, proposals for combined programs where the requirements of the established component programs were not changed, would be received by the Committee for information. This was the case for this item.

A member asked what provision would be made for students who undertook the combined program and subsequently ran into problems. Professor Tuohy took the question under advisement.

- (b) School of Graduate Studies: Direct Admission to PhD Program – Graduate Departments of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations, and Germanic Languages and Literatures

Professor Tuohy recalled that the Committee had seen a number of requests for direct entry programs and that they were becoming more routine. The Guidelines, in fact, had included these as matters that could be delegated to the divisional council for approval. The School of Graduate Studies had, however, been asked to draft guidelines to be applied in these proposals to ensure consistency. The Committee would receive and be asked to approve these guidelines. A member supported the need for guidelines. She referred to the program that required an A-average be maintained and asked what would happen should the student fail to maintain that average. The guidelines should make the consequences clear.

A member who was also a member of an SGS committee that reviewed these proposals noted the care and detail with which they were considered and approved. SGS was also concerned that genuine master's be awarded and that they not be viewed as failed PhD degrees.

A member commented that there were no such direct admission programs in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and he asked how wide-spread the practice was. Professor Tuohy indicated that the Committee had dealt with a number of them and that a list could be compiled. She said that as recommended by the Orchard task force on graduate student support, many divisions were reviewing their graduate program offerings. In order to be competitive with American universities for the best students in humanities and social sciences, direct-entry programs were necessary.

A member noted that in his division, students were enrolled in the master's program and then after a year of work, an evaluation could be made on whether the student should proceed directly to the PhD. It sometimes happened with students who had a master's degree from another institution that they would first be enrolled in the master's program and then moved to the PhD. Professor Tuohy said that this issue was certainly a matter of debate for SGS.

**Report Number 96 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 23, 2002**

---

**9. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the date of the next meeting was Wednesday, December 4, 2002.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

---

Secretary  
October 26, 2002

---

Chair

23641